

IN THE DRAWINGS

In a Submission of Replacement Drawings filed concurrently herewith, it is respectfully requested to replace the eight (8) replacement drawing sheets filed July 27, 2001 with the attached 8 sheets of amended drawings. In the replacement drawing sheets, Fig. 9 has been amended to include an annotation of "Prior Art" in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion.

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese Patent Application Publication No. 11-127297 to Tanimoto.

Drawings and Specification stand objected to because of minor informalities.

Summary of Response to the Office Action

Applicants amend claims 1-9 to further define the invention. Accordingly, claims 1-9 are presently pending for consideration. In addition, Applicants amend Specification in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion. Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit concurrently herewith Submission of Replacement Drawings including eight (8) sheets of formal drawings.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

In the Office Action, claims 1-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese Patent Application Publication No. 11-127297 to Tanimoto. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims for at least the following reasons.

(i). Independent claims 1, 4, 6, and 8:

Independent claims 1 and 4, as amended, both recite an image information processing apparatus including, in part, control means which immediately decompresses the image data included in the image information when the attribute information and the image data are determined to be arranged in the predetermined sequence. Similarly, independent claims 6 and 8, as amended, both recite a computer-readable storage medium including, in part, a decompression step of immediately decompressing the image data included in the image

information when the attribute information and the image data are determined to be arranged in the predetermined sequence. Applicants respectfully submit that at least these features of amended independent claims 1, 4, 6, and 8 are neither taught nor suggested by Tanimoto.

In contrast to the Applicants' claimed invention, as described at paragraph [0037] and as depicted in FIG. 2, Tanimoto teaches that the step 5 of FIG. 2 (i.e., control means) is a decision making step equipped in the receiver device to perform single task; filters out whether the incoming TIFF header information is in the "arranged" or "non-arranged" format. On the other hand, "control means" equipped in the receiver device of the present application is adapted to perform multiple tasks; determines whether the attribute information and the image data are arranged in a predetermined sequence, and immediately decompresses the image data included in the image information when the attribute information and the image data are determined to be arranged in the predetermined sequence. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that software of Tanimoto appears that it does not enable the receiver device to perform multiple tasks at step 5. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Tanimoto fails to teach or suggest every element of the amended independent claims 1, 4, 6, and 8.

(ii). Independent claims 2, 5, 7, and 9:

Independent claim 2, as amended, recites an image information processing apparatus including, in part, "control means which stores-formation indicating that attribute information and image data are arranged in a predetermined sequence into header information pertaining to the image information, and which produces the image information by means of storing the attribute information and the image data in a predetermined sequence." Similarly, independent

claim 5, as amended, recites an image information processing apparatus including, in part, “output means which exchanges with a receiver device which is to send the image information, negotiation information pertaining to a layout sequence of the attribute information and the image data, and which outputs the image information, and control means which arranges the attribute information and the image data in a predetermined sequence on the basis of the result of exchange of the negotiation information, thereby producing the image information, and which outputs the image information to the output means.” Furthermore, independent claim 7, as amended, recites a computer-readable storage medium including, in part, “a sequential information storage step of storing information indicating that the attribute information and the image data are stored in a predetermined sequence into header information of the image information; an image information generation step of producing the image information by means of storing the attribute information and the image data in the predetermined sequence.” In addition, independent claim 9, as amended, recites a computer-readable storage medium including, in part, “a negotiation processing step of conducting negotiations in connection with a layout sequence of the image data and the attribute information with a receiver device which sends the image information; an image information generation step of producing the image information by means of arranging the attribute information and the image data in a predetermined sequence on the basis of the result of negotiations performed in the negotiation processing step.” Applicants respectfully submit that at least these features of amended independent claims 1-2 and 4-9 are neither taught nor suggested by Tanimoto.

In contrast to the Applicants' claimed invention, Tanimoto is completely silent about the functions of the sender device and software, which are adapted to perform multiple tasks; producing the information indicating that the attribute information and the image data are generated/stored in a predetermined sequence, and producing the image information from the attribute information and the image data arranged in the predetermined sequence (Tanimoto at paragraphs [0029], [0030], and [0034])." Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Tanimoto also fails to teach or suggest every element of the amended independent claims 2, 5, 7, and 9, and hence dependent claim 3.

#

Accordingly, in light of the arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully request that rejection of claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn because Tanimoto fails to anticipate at least the features of amended independent claims 1-2 and 4-9. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claim 3, as amended is not anticipated by Tanimoto because of its dependency from respective amended independent claim 2.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application, withdrawal of all rejections, and the timely allowance of all pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.R.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By:



Robert J. Goodell
Reg. No. 41,040

Dated: September 30, 2005

Customer No. 09629

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004

Telephone: (202) 739-3000

Facsimile: (202) 739-3001

RGJ2/SO:fdb